

SPF Diversity Solution Report  
CALNET Backbone

Prepared for Kari McConnell  
State of California  
Department of General Services  
By MCI and SBC

January 7, 2005

Kari,

In response to your request, I've listed the DS3 orders separately to give attention to detail on each as all 3 had unique delaying issues. Closing with a full summary.

[San Luis Obispo to Monterey](#) – This order is ready to test now and in joint coordination with SBC to facilitate the activation. The delay that occurred was revisited between ourselves and SBC. The original LOA sent to us by AT&T had to be cancelled and reissued. The reason being is that there were design and engineering issues surrounding the validation of the CFA provided by AT&T as the lease provider. In addition, confirmation of the design layout record could not be obtained from AT&T. Therefore the order suffered. Going forward, we've confirmed that the guidelines in place for each carrier are geared towards a more standard order flow process; and that we are all on the same page.

[Bakersfield to Gardena](#) – Sprint was the original choice as the lease provider for this location. However, SBC did not have the "stand alone facilities" at this location to meet Sprint. Additionally, we were advised by Sprint that there was not a signed "billing packet" agreement between SBC and Sprint. (Meaning that non customer loops are restricted). This drove us to choose another vendor (Wiltel) that could accommodate us without restriction, but the process had to start all over. The LOA has been received from Wiltel and we (MCI) are waiting for the DLR from SBC.

[Sacramento to Chico](#) – Sprint was also the carrier of choice on this order and incurred the same problem as the Bakersfield location. We ended up choosing Global Crossing as the lease provider and have received the LOA from them and forwarded to SBC.

### [Current Status](#)

[San Luis Obispo to Monterey](#) – Pending testing with SBC and lease subcontractor AT&T. Looking to turn up by 1/17/05.

[Bakersfield to Gardena](#) - Corrected LOA received 1/5/05 from lease subcontractor Wiltel; awaiting DLR from SBC, looking to turn up before 1/31/05.

[Sacramento to Chico](#) – LOA from lease subcontractor Global Crossing received on 1/5/05 and forwarded to SBC. DLR also pending on this order. Turn up before 1/31/05.

### [Summary](#)

Each leased circuit was ordered during the first week in September. This was after we verified capacity and who the lease subcontractors would be. At that time, Sprint for 2 orders and AT&T 1. Orders were apparently on track to complete in the mid November timeframe. However, Sprint advised that their internal process would not allow us to continue with them as a vendor citing stand alone facilities issues with SBC. This affected both orders that involved Sprint so we chose Wiltel and Global Crossing as new vendors. Thus, the due dates had to be changed to the mid December timeframe. AT&T remained in place.

Part of the ordering process involves the lease provider to send MCI their LOA; which is forwarded to SBC to start their design. We had to escalate to receive the LOA's from Global Crossing and Wiltel which we finally received. However, the longer it takes to get the LOA, it affects the

processing timeframes for MCI and SBC. Once SBC creates the design from the LOA, it's sent back to MCI to forward back to the lease provider. Then assignments are confirmed and testing is scheduled.

Being that we did not receive the LOA's from the 2 new vendors until this week, another change had to take place by pushing the due dates to the end of January.